APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/765,338	01/26/2004	Christopher Clemmett Macleod Beck	P8600	9881

24739   7590   12/21/2011
CENTRAL COAST PATENT AGENCY, INC
3 HANGAR WAY SUITE D
WATSONVILLE, CA 95076

EXAMINER
CHEEMA, UMAR

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2444	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/21/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

officeactions@CENTRALCOASTPATENT.COM
plambuth@centralcoastpatent.com

	Application No.	**Applicant(s)**
	10/765,338	MACLEOD BECK ET AL.
Office Action Summary	**Examiner**	**Art Unit**	
	UMAR CHEEMA	2444	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _12 August 2011_.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on _____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.

4) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

5) ☒ Claim(s) _40-42,46-53,70-72 and 75-82_ is/are pending in the application.

    5a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

7) ☒ Claim(s) _40-42,46-53,70-72 and 75-82_ is/are rejected.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

9) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

10) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

11) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   This action is in response to the amendment filed on 08/12/2011.

2.   Claims 40-42, 46-53, 70-72, and 75-82 are pending in this action.

Response to Arguments

3.   Applicant's arguments, see remarks, filed 08/12/2011, with respect to Claims 40-42, 47,

49-53, 70-72, and 75, 76, 78, 79, 81-82 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Parekh in view of Smith and Hasan have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

4.   Applicant's response to Office Action mailed on 04/28/2011, see remarks, pages 7-12,

contain merely acknowledgement of examiner's action and copy of claims detailed rejection has

been respectfully considered and acknowledged by examiner.

5.   On pages 13-16, see remarks, section Applicant's response:

        a.   Applicant argues that examiner states "As to claims 40 and 70, Parekh discloses a

        communication management system and method, comprising: a computer appliance

        associated with a particular user (see abstract, par. (0017) Fig. 2;..." however applicant

        strongly urges that there is absolutely nothing found in Parekh that teaches or infers **a**

        computer appliance associated with a particular user. Therefore the reference Parekh

        fails to teach or suggest the first limitation in claim 40, a computer appliance associated

        with a particular user.

b.   Applicant further argues that another very serious problem with the reference

Parekh is that claims 40 and 70 are limited to "**communications**", and recite **a firewall**

through which incoming and outgoing communications pass. As is abundantly clear

considering claim 46, which recites:

"46. (Previously presented) The system of claim 40 wherein messaging in

multiple modes and protocols is supported, including but not limited to voice and text."

...that the communications are messages. The examiner, after four years in

prosecution of this case, comprising eight actions and seven response, is trying to stretch

the "**communications**" limitation, which are clearly messaging, to simple transmission of

data as taught in Parekh. Parekh does not teach or suggest management of messages as

communications, and the examiner must be fully aware of this fact. In further support of

this failure of the reference Parekh, the examiner applies Parekh in rejecting claim 46 as

follows:

"As to claim 46, Parekh discloses the system of claim 40 wherein messaging in

multiple modes and protocols is supported, including but not limited to voice and text

(see at least paragraphs (0045, 0058, 0088))."

Thus, it is quit clear that paragraphs 0045, 0058 and 88 has nothing to do with the

limitation to which it is applied, that, is messaging in multiple modes and protocols.

As to point a, examiner respectfully considered applicant's arguments, however they are not

persuasive. As stated previously Parekh teaches a communication management system and

method, comprising: a computer appliance associated with a particular user (See at least abstract,

par. (0017), Figure 2). Although Applicant believes that these passages of Parekh do not teach or

suggest such limitation, examiner disagrees with applicant's arguments. Parekh is related

managing customers in <u>a hierarchical manner wherein customer (i.e. particular user) comprises a</u>

<u>root services provider, tiered service providers and end customers</u>. The invention <u>enables the</u>

<u>governing of the customers by a larger service providers as customers and managing their</u>

<u>resources (such as policies etc.)</u> and wherein a policy is a set of rules laid down by the service

provider (i.e. administrator) to control the customers. Figure 2 details the hierarchical service

management system with <u>a user interface and a policy enforcement device,</u> and wherein <u>the user</u>

<u>interface and policy enforcement device being controlled by the service management system (i.e.</u>

<u>particular administrator or user)</u> (See paragraph (0017), Fig. 2). Thus Further Figures 3a and 3b

shows <u>a rule creation in the hierarchical service management system by a customer</u> (i.e.

particular user) (See paragraph (0018), Figures 3a and 3b). Thus it is examiner's position that

Parekh teaches or suggests a computer appliance associated with a particular user as claimed in

claims 40 and 70.

As to point b, examiner respectfully considered applicant's arguments, however they are not

persuasive. Applicant argues that claims 40 and 70 are limited to "**communications**", and recite

a firewall through which incoming and outgoing communications pass. As is abundantly clear

considering claim 46, which recites, "the system of claim 40 wherein messaging in multiple

modes and protocols is supported, including but not limited to voice and text." Thus, ...that the

communications are messages. Examiner disagree with applicant's argument and further clarify

that such limitations are taught or suggest by Parekh and further in view of Smith, Hasan and

Pounds as previously cited in office action. Parekh teaches wherein multiple modes and protocol

is supported (See Parekh: at least paragraphs (0045, 0058 and 0088)). First, Parekh teaches that a

person skilled in the art can appreciate that <u>various communication technologies may be used to</u>

<u>enable communication between the processing machines and/or storage elements in the form of a</u>

<u>network. Such communication technologies may use various protocols such as TCP/IP, UDP,</u>

<u>ATM or OSI</u>. As detailed in previous office action that Parekh fails to expressly disclose

wherein messaging can be voice and text. In analogous teaching Pounds teaches: wherein

messing can be voice and text (See Pounds: at least abstract, col. 5, lines 57-63; <u>enabling voice,</u>

<u>data, video, and other communications to occur in an efficient and integrated manner</u>) for the

motivation of allocating and utilizing available communications sources.

Secondly, although Parekh teaches a device (i.e. 202) (Fig. 2) which has policy enforcement

rules (i.e. functions of a firewall), examiner states in previous office action that Parekh expressly

fails to teach a firewall through which incoming and outgoing communication pass. However, In

analogous teaching, Hasan exemplifies this wherein Hasan teaches: wherein firewall acting as an

enforcer of management policies and serving as a gateway is, at the computer appliance through

which incoming and outgoing communications; and wherein individual incoming or outgoing

communications are associated at the identity/zone firewall with a zone, by one or both of

identities of sender and receiver and message content, and the management policies specific to

that zone are enforced before the communications are allowed to pass (see Hasan: at least

paragraphs (0086, 0103, 0129, 0132, 0136), Figures 1 and 9B; wherein the <u>policy management</u>

<u>application 252 enforces</u> subscriber level access control policies to maintain the data integrity

and validates policies installed; <u>the policy configuration engine 276 uses a policy string or set of</u>

strings that mimics well-known or commercially utilized policies for services such as firewalls
which are sent to the multifunction device for VPN and firewall policies; the content services
application for the VPN can search through rules to allow appropriate setting for protocols to
pass through a firewall etc.). Thus it is examiner's position that Parekh in view of in view of
Smith, Hasan and Pounds teaches or suggests applicant's claims 40, 46 and 70.

      On pages 17-27, see remarks, section Applicant's response:

            c.   Applicant's argues that Parekh fails to teach "a zone manager enabling
the user to create one or more zones defined each by a business or a social
activity, to associate specific contact identities with individual ones of the
zones created, and to create management policies associated with and
specific to each zone created;" The examiner neglects entirely to show any
art for "associating contact identities with individual ones of the zones created."
Further applicant argues that "zone manager recited in the claim enables the user
to create the zones defined each by a business or social activity". Further
applicant argues that there is no teaching in Parekh that "a user of the
management system is enabled to create these policies and associate them with
specific to each zone created". Lastly, applicant argues that "a data repository
coupled to the computer appliance storing a directory of contact identities...
wherein individual incoming or outgoing communications are associated at the
identity/zone firewall with a zone, by one or both of identities of sender and
receiver and message content, and the management policies specific to that zone

are enforced before the communications are allowed to pass" are not taught or

suggest by Parekh, Smith and Hasan.

As to point c, examiner has respectfully considered applicant's main point of arguments as

presented above but they are not persuasive. First applicants argument that Parekh in view of

Smith and Hasan fails to teach "a zone manager enabling the user to create one or more zones

defined each by a business or a social activity, to associate specific contact identities with

individual ones of the zones created, and to create management policies associated with and

specific to each zone created;" The examiner neglects entirely to show any art for "associating

contact identities with individual ones of the zones created," are not persuasive. As these

limitations are clearly taught or suggested in Parekh in view of Smith and Hasan. Although

Parekh teaches the concept of "a zone manager enabling the user to create one or more zones

defined each by a business or a social activity, to associate specific contact identities with

individual ones of the zones created, and to create management policies associated with and

specific to each zone created" (Parekh: abstract, wherein managing customers in <u>a hierarchical</u>

<u>manner wherein customer (i.e. particular user) comprises a root services provider, tiered service</u>

<u>providers and end customers</u>. The invention <u>enables the governing of the customers by a larger</u>

<u>service providers as customers and managing their resources (such as policies etc.)</u> and wherein a

policy is a set of rules laid down by the service provider (i.e. administrator) to control the

customers and <u>enable by the service provider (i.e. administrator) to control the customers and to</u>

<u>implement different policies on different customers and change the policy for a customer without</u>

<u>affecting other customers</u>. Figure 2 details the hierarchical service management system with <u>a</u>

<u>user interface and a policy enforcement device,</u> and wherein <u>the user interface and policy</u>

enforcement device being controlled by the service management system (i.e. particular

administrator or user) (See paragraph (0017), Fig. 2). Thus Further Figures 3a and 3b shows a

rule creation in the hierarchical service management system by a customer (i.e. particular user)

(See paragraph (0018), Figures 3a and 3b)). Even though examiner believes that there is no

difference between applicant's claimed created zones and Parekh's customer, resources and

policies associated with them, however, examiner further provided the reference Smith for

applicant's arguments and further for zones to be defined each by **a business or a social**

activity. Smith teaches one or more zones are defined by a business or a social activity; and

associate specific contact identities with individual ones of the zones created (see Smith at least

abstract, Fig. 4, 5 and details; wherein an interactive collaborative information system creating

and link information such as emails, bulletin boards, chats, politics, and other activities etc. (i.e.

social and/or business activities); further Smith talks about collaborating information which is

based on the created groups (i.e. zones) interest, for example Usenet newsgroups, wherein news

group nodes are linked together by links representing messages that are cross-posted between the

news groups; in another case a GUI allows a user to control and filter the selected portion of the

collaborative information in the groups to be obtained and measured (i.e. policies)).

Furthermore, with respect to applicant's argument "a data repository coupled to the computer

appliance storing a directory of contact identities... wherein individual incoming or outgoing

communications are associated at the identity/zone firewall with a zone, by one or both of

identities of sender and receiver and message content, and the management policies specific to

that zone are enforced before the communications are allowed to pass", it is clear from the Smith

and Hasan references that such limitations are taught or suggested for at least given reasons.

First examiner noted that Applicant believes that examiner is equating "resources" in Smith to applicant's zones. Examiner disagrees with applicant because as stated in above arguments examiner believes that any of collaboration media such as "email and email lists, conferencing systems, and bulletin boards, chats, multi-user dungeons, multi-user games and graphical virtual worlds, etc." can read on applicant's claimed zones (See Smith: abstract, col. 5, lines 32-42).

Secondly, applicant's arguments toward "contact identities" that Smith's contact are not same as applicant's claimed contact identities. Examiner respectfully disagrees, first, applicant's dependent claims 41 and 51 recites that contact identities may be names or aliases of person or devices and further contact identity may be in a form of a URI, an email address, a telephone number, a machine address, an IP address, or a text messaging address. Examiner believes that in Smith (See at abstract, Figures 6-8) wherein a computer-controlled process connect with database (i.e. data repository) obtains information related to a selected set of Usenet newsgroups, for example, information obtained by Newsgroups header contains Message-ID and references, the form field identifies the poster and may include his email address and name etc. (See Smith: Fig. 8, col. 7, line 57-col. 8, line 10).

Lastly as addressed above in response to argument b, Hasan teaches wherein individual incoming or outgoing communications are associated at the identity/zone firewall with a zone, by one or both of identities of sender and receiver and message content, and the management policies specific to that zone are enforced before the communications are allowed to pass (see Hasan: at least paragraphs (0086, 0103, 0129, 0132, 0136), Figures 1 and 9B; wherein the policy

management application 252 enforces subscriber level access control policies to maintain the

data integrity and validates policies installed; the policy configuration engine 276 uses a policy

string or set of strings that mimics well-known or commercially utilized policies for services

such as firewalls which are sent to the multifunction device for VPN and firewall policies; the

content services application for the VPN can search through rules to allow appropriate setting for

protocols to pass through a firewall etc.).

It appears throughout Applicant's argument that Applicant is arguing that each reference

individually should teach or suggest applicant's arguments. In response to applicant's arguments

against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references

individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642

F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375

(Fed. Cir. 1986).

Applicant has not presented any other argument which are different than those responded

above. Therefore, it is examiner's position that Parekh in view of Smith, Hasan and Pounds

teaches or suggests claims 40, 70 and their dependent claims 41, 42, 46-53, 71, 72, and 75-82.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 40-42, 47, 49-53, 70-72, and 75, 76, 78, 79, 81-82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over Parekh et al. (hereinafter Parekh) (US Pub. No.

2004/0215630) in view of Smith et al. (hereinafter Smith) (US Patent No. 6,594,673) and further

in view of Hasan et al. (hereinafter Hasan) (US Pub. No. 2003/0110262).

7.   As to claims 40 and 70, Parekh discloses a communication management system and

method, comprising: a computer appliance associated with a particular user (*see at least abstract,*

paragraph (0017) Fig. 2; a policy enforcement device (202)); a data repository coupled to the

computer appliance storing a directory of contact identities (*see at least paragraph (0038), Fig.*

2, database (204) which contains (customers, resources, policies)); a zone manager (i.e. 212)

(*resource manager*) (Fig. 2) enabling the user to create one or more zones defined each by a

business or a social activity (*see at least paragraph (009, 0032, 0034), Fig. 1, RSP (102) with*

sub customers TSP1, TSP2, EC1 and TSP1 with further branches etc.), and to create

management policies associated with and specific to each zone created (*see at least paragraphs*

(0036, 0037), RSP and TSP then control their immediate customers by implementing policies

and allocating resources to their immediate customers, further the attributes of the resources can

be number of rules, the number of IP addresses and the bandwidth etc.); and an identity/zone

firewall acting as an enforcer of management policies and serving as a gateway at the computer

appliance through which incoming and outgoing communications pass (*see at least paragraph*

(0045, 0058, 0059), Figures 4a and 4b, tables 1 and 2 and related details).

8.   Although, Parekh discloses the substantial feature of applicant's claimed invention,

Parekh fails to expressly disclose: wherein creating one or more zones are defined by a business

or a social activity; and associate specific contact identities with individual ones of the zones

created. Nevertheless, these features were well known in the art at the time of present invention.

9.   In analogous teaching, Smith exemplifies this wherein Smith teaches: creating one or

more zones are defined by a business or a social activity; and associate specific contact identities

with individual ones of the zones created (*see Smith at least abstract, Fig. 4, 5 and details;*

wherein an interactive collaborative information system creating and link information such as

emails, bulletin boards, chats, politics, and other activities etc.).

10.   Thus given the teaching of Smith, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill

person in the art of networking to combine the teaching of Parekh into Smith for creating social

or business zones. Motivation for doing so would have been to allow users to more easily find

other users with the same interested.

11.   Although, Parekh-Smith discloses the substantial features of applicant's claimed

invention, Parekh further fails to expressly disclose: wherein firewall acting as an enforcer of

management policies and serving as a gateway is, at the computer appliance through which

incoming and outgoing communications; and wherein individual incoming or outgoing

communications are associated at the identity/zone firewall with a zone, by one or both of

identities of sender and receiver and message content, and the management policies specific to

that zone are enforced before the communications are allowed to pass.

12.   In analogous teaching, Hasan exemplifies this wherein Hasan teaches: wherein firewall

acting as an enforcer of management policies and serving as a gateway is, at the computer

appliance through which incoming and outgoing communications; and wherein individual

incoming or outgoing communications are associated at the identity/zone firewall with a zone, by

one or both of identities of sender and receiver and message content, and the management

policies specific to that zone are enforced before the communications are allowed to pass (*see*

Hasan: at least paragraphs (0086, 0103, 0129, 0132, 0136), Figures 1 and 9B).

13.   Thus given the teaching of Hasan, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill

person in the art of networking to combine the teaching of Parekh-Smith into Hasan for firewall

acting as a management policy enforcer. Motivation for doing so would have been to make user

created zones more secure by having individual security parameters.

14.   As to claim 41, Parekh-Smith disclose wherein Smith further discloses the system of

claim 40 wherein contact identities may be names or aliases of person or devices (*see Smith at*

least abstract, Fig. 4, 5 and details).

15.   As to claim 42, Parekh discloses the system of claim 40 further comprising an interface to

a network, wherein the communication involves sending or receiving message over the network

(*see at least paragraphs (0045, 0058, 0059, 0088)*).

16.   As to claims 43-45, (Cancelled).

17.   As to claim 47, Parekh disclose the system of claim 40 wherein contact identities of

single users or devices may vary by communication mode as well as by zone (*see at least*

paragraphs (0045, 0058, 0059, 0088)).

18.   As to claim 49, Parekh discloses the system of claim 40 wherein contact identities

include both sender and recipients (*see at least paragraphs (0045, 0058, 0059, 0088)*).

19.   As to claim 50, Parekh discloses the system of claim 40 further comprising generated

alerts from attempted policy violation (*see at least paragraph (0045, 0058, 0059)*).

20.   As to claim 51, Parekh discloses the system of claim 41 wherein contact identity name

may be in a form of a URI, an email address, a telephone number, a machine address, an IP

address, or a text message (*see at least paragraphs (0036, 0037)*).

21.   As to claim 52, the combination of Parekh-Hasan discloses the system of claim 40

wherein management policy includes automatic handling of incoming communication events, the

handling determined by one or both of contact identity and mode of communication (*see Parekh:

paragraphs (0045, 0058, 0059) and Hasan: at least paragraphs (0148)*).

22.   As to claim 53, Parekh discloses the system of claim 40 further comprising an interactive

user interface for a user to create and populate zones, enter contact identities and create, edit, and

associate policy (*see at least paragraphs (0029, 0032, 0048)*).

23.   As to claims 54-69, 73 and 74, (Cancelled).

24.   As to claims 71-72 and 75-76, 78, 79, 81 and 82, there claimed limitations are same as

previously addressed claims 41-42, and 47, 49-53 except being method claims and therefore are

rejected for the same rational as 41-42, and 47, 49-53.

25.   Claims 46, 48, 77 and 80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Parekh-Smith-Hasan and further in view of Pounds et al . (hereinafter Pounds) (US Patent No.

6,560,222).

26.   As to claim 46, Parekh discloses the system of claim 40 wherein messaging in multiple

modes and protocols is supported, including but not limited to voice and text (*see at least*

paragraphs (0045, 0058, 0088)) but fails to expressly disclose wherein messaging can be voice

and text. In analogous teaching Pounds teaches: wherein messing can be voice and text (*see*

Pounds: at least abstract, col. 5, lines 57-63; enabling voice, data, video, and other

communications to occur in an efficient and integrated manner) for the motivation of allocating

and utilizing available communications sources.

27.   As to claim 48, the combination of Parekh-Pounds disclose wherein the system of claim

46 wherein the multiple modes and protocols include email, instant messaging, RSS, voice

mode, network-news transport protocol (NNTP), file transport protocol (FTP), really simple

syndication (RSS), universal discovery_ description and integration (UDDI), lightweight

directory_ access protocol (LDAP), multipurpose internet mail extensions (MIME, post office

protocol (POP), simple mail transport protocol (SMTP), Internet message access protocol

(IMAP), session initiation protocol (SIP), text messaging services (TMS), and hypertext

transport protocol (HTTP) (*see at least Parekh: paragraphs (0045, 0058, 0059, 0088) and*

Pounds: col. 40, lines 1-34).

28.   As to claims 77 and 80, there claimed limitations are same as previously addressed

claims 46 and 48 except being method claims and therefore are rejected for the same rational.

Conclusion

        THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

        A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

        Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to UMAR CHEEMA whose telephone number is (571)270-3037.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30AM-5:00PM.

    If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Peter-Anthony Pappas can be reached on 571-272-7646. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

    Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/U. C./
Examiner, Art Unit 2444

/Djenane M Bayard/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2444